MR. GENO: So you know, Your Honor, 1 2 and I'll get to this in more detail. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I really do appreciate this -- go ahead. 4 MR. GENO: The Southern California 5 6 Regional Railway Authority contract that everybody's talked about so far, is set for 7 approval before the bankruptcy court on November 8 9 21st. We filed a motion to assume that 10 contract October the 12th. We also hope to, by 11 12 the end of this week or early next week, file motions to assume all of the other active pre-13 petition sale contracts, to the extent the Court 14 will set those on November 21st for hearing, 15 we'll ask the court to do that. 16 If not, we have November 28th and 17 29th, I believe, also set aside for hearings on 18 19 those. So we're going to know how the bankruptcy court feels about this and the other 20 contracting parties and other interested parties 21 22 feel about this pretty soon.

1	That's as to the pre-bankruptcy sale
2	contracts that are still active and the debtor
3	moves to assume and ask bankruptcy court
4	approval on.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, these contracts
6	though, they're not, they don't have anything to
7	do with the contracts that these applicant
8	parties have in this case, or they are the same,
9	one and the same?
10	MR. GENO: Yes, sir.
11	MR. KELLER: These are
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, well, don't
13	you need the consent of the applicant parties
14	for that too?
15	MR. GENO: We do, Your Honor. We
16	sure do.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have them all?
18	MR. GENO: Not all.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Have all of them
20	signed on?
21	MR. GENO: Not all. Most, but not
22	all.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Interesting. And what
2	do they stand to gain from this, the applicant
3	parties? They're obviously going to receive
4	something of value for those contracts, right?
5	MR. GENO: They would have bankruptcy
6	court approval for the consummation of those
7	contracts to go forward, subject to approval
8	here.
9	MR. KELLER: Your Honor, if I may?
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Hold on just a second.
11	I'm thinking. Now this evaluation, this \$48
12	million evaluation back in 2008, did you say?
13	MR. GENO: \$42 million, Your Honor,
14	in 2008.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did I say I meant
16	to say 42. Have you, Miss Kane, have you seen
17	that?
18	MS. KANE: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Have you seen that
20	\$42 million evaluation?
21	MS. KANE: We haven't seen the
22	actual paperwork related to that. We've only

seen the document that was submitted with the 1 2 bankruptcy court that just identified it as, I think it was \$45 million as a valuation of the 3 licenses as of 2008. 4 As I said, we've only seen the one 5 6 contract that they entered into with the applicant parties, that put a price for various 7 portions of the spectrum of one of the four 8 9 licenses. That was \$7. 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: That was the \$7 million MS. KANE: 11 12 price. You know the \$13 million number that Mr. Geno just provided is the first we've heard 13 of that, but in terms of placing a value on the 14 spectrum, I think Mr. McFadden articulated it 15 very well before, which is that Maritime has 16 17 negotiated a value in each of these contracts. And, as Mr. Keller informed you 18 19 earlier, each of those contracts do not cover 20 the entirety of those licenses. There are still large portions of 21 22 those licenses up for sale at, potentially, the

market value that they've already set for the 1 2 other portions. For example, the SCRRA license has a 3 .35 cents per megahertz per pop, which is the 4 way that these are valued, for approximately 5 6 half of the geographic license. So, arguably, there's still half of 7 that license left that could be offered at .35 8 9 cents per megahertz/pop, or some other amount, which could amount to \$7 million or more. 10 I mean, if we're at \$13 million 11 12 already, that's not a very far way to go to \$24, which, as Mr. McFadden articulated, is the 13 most that would possibly be allowed for 14 innocent creditors. 15 That number may, in fact, be reduced 16 17 as we determine the relationship between some of these creditors and Maritime and the alleged 18 19 wrong-doing here. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. That's a 20 lot to chew on, at least for me. But, what I -21 - is there any obligation to the Bureau and Mr. 22

McFadden getting copies of those evaluations, 1 both the \$48 million one and the current one, 2 3 where you come up with the \$13 million? mean, can they see those numbers? 4 5 MR. GENO: I actually do not have --6 the debtor does not have the appraisal either, It's held by the major secured 7 Your Honor. They tell us what the value is. 8 creditor. 9 They have not shared that with us. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, any --10 MR. GENO: And, as to the contracts, 11 12 there are confidentiality clauses in many of the contracts, but with bankruptcy being a 13 transparent proceeding, we're going to ask all 14 of the other contracting parties if we can 15 16 simply attach copies of those contracts to the 17 papers we filed in bankruptcy. So once they're filed, as was the case with the Southern 18 19 California Railway, everybody will see those 20 contracts. MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, there's 21

a protective order entered in this case, with

1 each of the applicants who are subject to those 2 contracts. 3 There shouldn't be any basis why any of the parties in this room shouldn't have 4 access to those contracts, which we asked for 5 in discovery in July. 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: See, that's the 7 That's the problem, is you held off, problem. 8 you know, you dug your heels in on this 9 10 discovery, and now we're both stuck. Because I 11 can't give you a ruling. I can't give you an absolute ruling 12 13 that we're forever not going to hear this case, 14 unless it gets sent back to me. Nobody can go forward in this at 15 this posture. You've got to give that 16 17 information up, and she let you, Ms. Kane's -you've got a protective order, and we got some 18 pretty smart people in this room, and 19 somebody's got to figure it out before they 20 give it to me, because I'm not going to sit 21

here and figure it out in camera.

1	MR. KELLER: Your Honor, there's a
2	few things I'm concerned about. But first of
3	all, there's a difference between providing on
4	an informal basis some of this information
5	that's going to be transparent, as Mr. Geno
6	mentioned, in context of the bankruptcy anyway,
7	as opposed being, sort of, subject to just
8	open-ended discovery, you know, just allowing
9	discovery to go forward, but
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute.
11	That's not
12	MR. KELLER: No, no
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: we're not talking
14	about open-ended.
15	MR. KELLER: But the way this came
16	up, Ms. Kane keeps saying the Bureau requested
17	this, but they requested it in the context of
18	overall discovery requests.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're not you
20	know what? There's a procedure for doing that,
21	saying look, we'll give them half a loaf, but
22	we're not giving them a whole loaf.

1	MR. KELLER: But that's my point,
2	Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've seen a lot of
4	that happen in these cases. Not in these I
5	know I've seen a case like this, but I've seen
6	a lot of that happen in just as big cases, in
7	this agency.
8	Now why can't that be done? I mean,
9	you're not what you're doing is you're not
10	cooperating. You're not getting into the game
11	and making this thing work. You're holding
12	back, and it can't work when you hold back. Do
13	you understand what I'm saying?
14	MR. KELLER: I understand what
15	you're saying, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not going to
17	change you, though.
18	MR. KELLER: No, I didn't say that
19	either.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't want to
21	have to issue an order on this. I wish you
22	would just come forward with that information

1 and give it to the attorneys. 2 I don't know if you want to limit 3 the distribution of it, I don't know if everybody in this room has to see it or wants 4 to see it, at this point. 5 6 That's something else we can determine, if not here, down the road a bit. 7 But at least to the Bureau and to Mr. McFadden. 8 9 They're the ones that are litigating this case. MR. KELLER: I understand. 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Just give them what 11 12 they're asking for. You don't have to give 13 them the whole thing that they've asked for in a pleading, I mean, right now I'm saying give 14 them what they're asking for. I think it's 15 16 essential information. Is that correct? MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, we'd be 17 happy to draft a separate document request, or 18 19 a separate interrogatories that are directed to 20 just the Second Thursday issues, but --JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what I'm 21 22 trying to avoid.

1	MS. KANE: I understand that, I've -
2	
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: You've drafted so
4	many papers
5	MS. KANE: I
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: And I've gotten
7	nowhere, and they're good papers. Mr. McFadden
8	is saying wait, he doubles the size of your
9	papers.
10	MS. KANE: We try to be concise,
11	Your Honor.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: So there's got to be
13	notice of this thing, it certainly is not a
14	situation of inadequate notice.
15	MS. KANE: Well, we could identify a
16	request that we've already asked
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
18	MS. KANE: that are pertinent to
19	this issue. I don't have them right in front
20	of me, but
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I think Mr. Keller
22	knows exactly what's there. Just

1	MS. KANE: Well, I do too, Your
2	Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: tell him in a
4	phone call or a letter that, for the time
5	being, or pursuant to what the Judge said in
6	the conference this morning, we want you to
7	give us, boom.
8	And the rest of it is, right now, is
9	indeterminate, so that you're not being put
10	through an intense, you know, burden.
11	In other words, I'm carving out a
12	big exception to the discovery rules and to the
13	discovery documents that have been served on
14	you, to alleviate your situation as best I can.
15	But we have to bring the information
16	in that can move this case forward, one way or
17	the other. So you decide what you're going to
18	do.
19	MR. KELLER: Yes. The other
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, I'll issue
21	orders. I mean, if I have to, I'll go down
22	that road, but

1	MR. KELLER: Well
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: it's a waste of
3	time.
4	MR. KELLER: part of the problem
5	sitting here in just a vacuum like this, is
6	what that request will be, I mean, I would
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you have to
8	wait for, obviously you get the request
9	MR. KELLER: Obviously, if they
10	request just the contracts, that's one thing we
11	can deal with, but then if there start to be
12	other requests, and there's going to be other
13	interrogatories what I was going to suggest,
14	Your Honor, is
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
16	MR. KELLER: We're very shortly away
17	from, as Mr. Geno said, we're going into
18	bankruptcy court on the 21st on the hearing on
19	the Southern California contract. He's making
20	yeoman efforts to try and get all the other
21	contracts put into that.
22	In the meantime, we're separately

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

working with trying to put together something for the whole shooting match. In other words, the remainder.

And to respond to Mrs. Kane's thing,
I can't disclose a lot of the details right
now, but the parties we're talking to about
that would be creditors. I mean, in other
words, if somebody does come in to, sort of,
pick up the whole thing, it would be a
creditor, so it would be within the precedent
of the Mobile Media case, but what I was going
to say was, that hearing's coming up shortly.

In a very short time, we're going to be in a position to really know what we're shooting at here, to know what the transactions are, to know what the deals are going to be, and to put together a comprehensive Second Thursday showing on the basis of that. That's number one. So then we'll be dealing with a real set of transactions, not speculation.

Number two, in the process of doing that, the nature of the bankruptcy proceeding

NEAL R. GROSS

1	is in its it's much more transparent, quite
2	frankly, than a typical assignment of license
3	application proceeding at the FCC. Much of
4	that information is going to already, by its
5	very nature, come out in the context of the
6	bankruptcy. Once
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Maybe we should
8	change our procedures.
9	MR. KELLER: Once that well, I'm
10	not saying that that was a good or a bad thing
11	
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I know.
13	MR. KELLER: I know, I know.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm just go ahead.
15	MR. KELLER: But it seems to me that
16	once we've got I would be happy to sit down
17	with the Bureau or even respond to requests,
18	once the actual proposal was before for them to
19	then people can sort of poke right now,
20	there's been objections made to just the
21	concept of us even trying to do Second
22	Thursday, before we've even had a chance to

formulate exactly what the details of the 1 proposal are going to be. 2 We put before you the details of the 3 The Bureau and the other parties can proposal. 4 then look at that and say, well, here's the 5 6 information we think we still need to know, but a lot of this information may be moot, based on 7 what the terms of the deal end up being. 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I --9 MR. KELLER: We're going to be at 10 that point in fairly short order. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that covers it. 12 13 All right, okay, okay. I appreciate what you're saying, and we can set a date for you 14 and Mr. Geno to file a definitive status report 15 on the bankruptcy, based on what you just 16 represented. I can do that. That'll be early. 17 That'll be, you know, sometime late November or 18 early December. 19 But today is a different issue. 20 What I started out asking for was there are two 21 estimate documents out there, or valuations, if 22

1	you will.
2	One of them is 2008 for \$7 million.
3	There's another one someplace for \$48 million,
4	and then there's the \$13 million that somebody
5	put in the bankruptcy proceeding, but from what
6	I hear from Mr. Geno, you don't even know what
7	that is, except the bottom line number. Is
8	that correct?
9	MR. GENO: That's right, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: And they won't
11	disclose it to you? They'll have to at some
12	point, but they're not, right now, they won't
13	disclose it?
14	MR. GENO: Well, they
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Whoever they are.
16	MR. GENO: They is Pinnacle Bank.
17	They have told us what their appraisal is
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Bank?
19	MR. GENO: Yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Chemical Bank?
21	MR. GENO: Pinnacle. Pinnacle.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: They were involved in

those chopped up mortgages, weren't they, in 1 2 some way? I mean --I don't know about that. 3 MR. GENO: JUDGE SIPPEL: A bank is holding 4 5 that information up? Okay, go ahead, I'm 6 sorry. 7 MR. GENO: I don't know about that, Your Honor. They requested the appraisal. 8 9 They are the senior secured creditor of the Sometime in 2008, and it was 10 debtor. performed, they told us the number, \$42 11 million, but they have not yet shared the 12 13 appraisal with us. We have asked for it, but do not yet 14 have the written document. The \$13 million 15 valuation is the net amount the bankrupt's 16 estate will receive if all of the existing pre-17 bankruptcy contracts are approved for the 18 debtor to assume. The FCC approves those, and 19 we get the money in hand. That's where the \$13 20 million comes from. 21

JUDGE SIPPEL: So it really isn't

something that's definitive. 1 2 MR. GENO: It is not. JUDGE SIPPEL: So do we even care 3 about that number now? I mean, for these 4 purposes, do we care about it? 5 6 MS. KANE: Your Honor, the amounts that Maritime has negotiated with these 7 applicants that --8 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: Those are different 10 numbers. Yes. MS. KANE: Well, to the extent that 11 that allegedly results in this \$13 million 12 13 dollars, those contracts are established, they're in Maritime's possession, and each of 14 those contracts sets a market value for the 15 spectrum at issue in this hearing. 16 So at the very least, we should be 17 entitled to those contracts, and we should be 18 entitled to any other valuations they may have. 19 Any other contracts they may have tried to 20 enter into, any other negotiations they're 21 entering into that puts a value on the spectrum 22

at issue here. That's tantamount to a Second Thursday analysis.

In addition, we should be entitled to discovery that identifies the various creditors on their list, and their involvement in any potential wrong-doing, based on their relationship with the various alleged wrong-doers, to determine if, in fact, they're innocent creditors, because, again, for a Second Thursday analysis, that will impact the amount of innocent creditor debt that must be paid.

Without that basic discovery, you know, it would be near impossible to determine whether or not they are entitled to Second Thursday.

And although Mr. Keller says they're willing to do that at whatever time in the future that they end up filing a motion for extraordinary relief under Second Thursday, there's no basis for why we shouldn't have that information now, in determining whether a

1	hearing would be inevitable.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's what I'm
3	trying to get at.
4	MR. KELLER: Your Honor
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what I'm
6	trying to get at.
7	MR. KELLER: Your Honor
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: How much information
9	of that nature can you give Ms. Kane?
10	MR. KELLER: I'll answer that in just
11	a second, but first I want to say one thing. I
12	disagree that at this stage the valuations are
13	that relevant. Within a very short time, we're
14	going to have actual contracts. It doesn't
15	matter what the valuations are. What
16	ultimately matters is how much money is going
17	to come in when these licenses are sold. We're
18	going to have actual contracts, approved by the
19	bankruptcy court, in part of applications filed
20	with the FCC. We'll have real numbers. We
21	won't have to be dealing with valuations.
22	Then, at that point, if somebody

wants to make an argument that that's too
little or too much, that's a different story,
but I think it's a waste of everybody's time
and money to engage in that exercise now, based
on speculative valuations. That's number one.

Number two, I will get with Mr. Geno and my client, and I think there's probably some way that we can do two things. We can probably find some way of providing, at least, subject to the protective order, and maybe in some redacted form on an informal basis, those contracts, releasing details of them, and also I have no objection to going through the list of creditors and identifying those who will not be included in any disbursements, and those who are, and a brief description of who they are and what they are.

And then, at that point, again, once that's all on the table, we can talk about whether any further information is needed. But to go -- see, part of the --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, wait a minute.

1	You've made good points here, I think. As a
2	preliminary, would both of you parties be
3	Mr. McFadden, Ms. Kane, would you be satisfied
4	with that?
5	MS. KANE: Well, if we could
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, I know you're
7	going to sit down and talk about it, I
8	understand that. But what I'm saying, that
9	process, would you be satisfied with that?
10	MS. KANE: Well that would be
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: For the time being.
12	MS. KANE: That would be a starting
13	point, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Yes, ma'am.
15	MS. KANE: But, no, I don't think we
16	should be subject to a redacted document from
17	the contracts. All of that should be covered
18	by the protective order that everybody in this
19	room and all of the applicants who are parties
20	to those contracts has signed.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
22	MS. KANE: So we

JUDGE SIPPEL: -- that's the first 1 2 time I've heard redacted. You're not talking about redacts, are you? 3 MR. KELLER: I've got to get with 4 the parties in terms of what the protective 5 6 order says and what the confidentiality 7 provision is, and, I mean, quite frankly, it just has not come up yet that we've considered 8 9 this sort of narrow providing of some information. 10 Everything's been looked at in terms 11 of overall discovery requests. Quite frankly, 12 13 I mean, the company does not have any money to pursue further litigation, including discovery. 14 And so that's why we sort of, under Second 15 Thursday said, let's stop everything if we can. 16 This sort of is a new concept of can 17 we provide some limited narrow amount of 18 information outside the context of normal 19 20 discovery, and we're willing to look at that and be as cooperative as we can. 21

JUDGE SIPPEL: You know, Mr. Keller,

1	on those general discovery documents, 1'm
2	always thinking that the ingenuity of lawyers
3	will take care of any problems with that
4	document. It's like a squeaking door.
5	Somebody's got to put the oil on it. That's
6	all it is.
7	MR. KELLER: Well
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: You could have done
9	this
LO	MR. KELLER: Your Honor
.1	JUDGE SIPPEL: two months ago.
L2	MR. KELLER: You're probably right
L3	about that, Your Honor, except the practical
L4	matter of whether where the work's at is an
L5	answer that is unsatisfactory, then, to the
16	party requesting, then a motion to compel, and
-7	then responses
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know
L9	MR. KELLER: and then the
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know how that
21	works.
22	MR. KELLER: And then we up the